

ON THE FUNCTIONAL EQUATION $Af^2 + Bg^2 = 1$ ON THE FIELD OF COMPLEX p -ADIC NUMBERS

EBERHARD MAYERHOFER

ABSTRACT. For a fixed prime p , let $\mathbb{C}_p$ denote the complex p -adic numbers. For polynomials $A, B \in \mathbb{C}_p[x]$ we consider decompositions $A(x)f^2(x) + B(x)g^2(x) = 1$ of entire functions f, g on $\mathbb{C}_p$ and try to improve an impossibility result due to A. Boutabaa concerning transcendental f, g . We also provide an independent proof of a p -adic diophantic statement due to D. N. Clark, which is an important ingredient of Boutabaa's method.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a prime p , let $\mathbb{C}_p$ denote the field of complex p -adic numbers, and let $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} \subset \mathbb{C}_p$ be the field of algebraic numbers over $\mathbb{Q}$. Furthermore, we denote by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ the ring of entire functions on $\mathbb{C}_p$. For a field K we denote by $K(x)$ the ring of rational functions over K , and $K[x]$ the ring of polynomials.

A. Boutabaa [1] has shown:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $A, B \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(x)$ be not identically zero. Suppose that $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ have coefficients in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and satisfy*

$$A(x)f^2(x) + B(x)g^2(x) = 1. \quad (1.1)$$

Then $f, g \in \mathbb{C}_p[x]$.

The main aim of this paper is to provide a self-contained proof of the following more general result in the case that A, B are polynomials:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $A, B \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$ be not identically zero. Suppose that $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ satisfy (1.1) and $g(0) \neq 0$. If $f^{(i)}(0) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $(0 \leq i \leq \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1)$ and $g^{(i)}(0) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $(0 \leq i < \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1)$, then $f, g \in \mathbb{C}_p[x]$.*

When $\deg A$ and $\deg B$ do not have the same parity, we have the following stronger conclusion:

Remark 1.3. *Let A, B be in $\mathbb{C}_p[x]$ such that $\deg A \not\equiv \deg B \pmod{2}$. Then equation (1.1) has no solutions in $(\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p))^2 \setminus \mathbb{C}_p^2$.*

We note that the method of this paper allows for a similar assertion as that of Theorem 1.2 in the more abstract setting, when $\mathbb{C}_p$ is replaced by an algebraically closed and topologically complete ultrametric field K of characteristic zero. This purely academic generalization however does not give more insight into the problem but only complicates notation and proofs. On the other hand, the case of K with non-zero characteristic clearly makes no sense here.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 39B52; Secondary: 12H25, 12J25, 30806 .

Key words and phrases. p -adic Analysis, p -adic functional equations, p -adic differential equations.

Work supported by FWF grant P16742-N04.

1.1. History. The problem of decomposing complex meromorphic functions f, g in the form $A(x)f^n + B(x)g^m = 1$, where A, B are certain meromorphic coefficients, has been thoroughly studied in the sixties and seventies of the last century. F. Gross [6] shows that $f^n + g^n = 1$ has no meromorphic solutions, when $n > 3$ and no entire solutions, if $n > 2$. Moreover, for $n = 2$ he characterizes all meromorphic solutions f, g . Generalizations of these results are due to C.-C. Yang [13] and N. Toda [12], and they are essentially applications of Nevanlinna Theory [8], in particular of the second Nevanlinna Theorem. To see the match with our work, let us specialize C.-C. Yang's quite general result [13] as follows:

Theorem 1.4. *For non-constant complex entire functions f, g , the functional equation*

$$A(x)f^m(x) + B(x)g^n(x) = 1, \quad (1.2)$$

where $A, B \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ cannot hold, unless $n \leq 2, m \leq 3$.

Note that in the case $n = m = 2$, $A = B = 1$, a well known pair of entire solutions are the sine and cosine.

In the p -adic domain, A. Boutabaa considers decompositions of this kind in [1]. Building on an improved version of the p -adic second Nevanlinna Theorem [3] it could be shown that compared with Theorem 1.4, the respective p -adic results are stronger:

Theorem 1.5. *For non-constant p -adic entire functions $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$, the functional equation (1.2) cannot hold with $A, B \in \mathbb{C}_p[x]$, unless $n = m = 2$.*

Note, that the pair of p -adic functions $\sin(x), \cos(x)$ is not entire, see also Example 3.2. This shortcoming motivates A. Boutabaa's "impossibility result" Theorem 1.1 when $n = m = 2$. Since the p -adic Nevanlinna Theory is not applicable in this case, Boutabaa employs a Diophantic approximation result for algebraic numbers due to D.N.Clark [4].

1.2. Program of paper. We start by recalling some elementary facts on entire functions and diophantic approximations of algebraic numbers in section 2. We then state a new proof of Clark's result (Proposition 2.5, see also Remark 2.6). In the final section 3 we present the proof of Theorem 1.2.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Notation 2.1.

- $|\cdot|_p$ denotes the p -adic absolute value on the field of complex p -adic numbers $\mathbb{C}_p$, and the respective additive valuation is given by $\text{ord}_p(x) := -\log_p(|x|_p)$, where $\log_p(\cdot)$ is the logarithm with base p .
- The "closed" disk with center $a \in \mathbb{C}_p$ and radius $r > 0$ equals

$$d(a, r) := \{x \in \mathbb{C}_p : |x - a| \leq r\}.$$

- We denote by $\mathbb{Z}_p$ the ring of p -adic integers, which is the topological completion of $\mathbb{N}$ with respect to the metric induced by the p -adic absolute value $|\cdot|_p$.
- For $\xi \in \mathbb{C}_p$ we define the hypergeometric coefficient $(\xi)_k$ inductively as

$$(\xi)_1 := \xi, \quad (\xi)_k := (\xi)_{k-1}(\xi - k + 1), \quad \text{when } k > 1.$$

- For a natural number n , $\sigma(n)$ is the sum of the digits in its expansion as a p -adic integer and the factorial satisfies

$$\text{ord}_p(n!) = \frac{n - \sigma_p(n)}{p - 1}, \quad (2.1)$$

see [10, p. 241].

- For a set $\mathcal{D}$, $|\mathcal{D}|$ denotes its cardinality. Furthermore, for a real number x , $[x]$ denotes its integral part. Accordingly, $\langle x \rangle := x - [x]$ is the fractional part of x .
- Finally, we denote by $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ the algebra of entire functions on $\mathbb{C}_p$, that is the set of formal power series $f(x) = \sum_{i \geq 0} c_i x^i$ with coefficients c_i in $\mathbb{C}_p$ for any $i \geq 0$ such that either $\{i \in \mathbb{N} : c_i \neq 0\}$ is finite (that is $f \in \mathbb{C}_p[x]$), or such that $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ord}_p(c_n) - \lambda n = \infty$.
- $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{C}_p$.

It is well known, that for any $r > 0$, $\mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ can be endowed by a multiplicative ultrametric norm $\| \cdot \| (r)$ defined as

$$\|f\|(r) := \max_{i \geq 0} |c_i|_p r^i = \max_{x \in d(0, r)} |f(x)|_p.$$

Also, as in classical complex analysis, we have “Liouville’s Theorem”: If for $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$, $\|f\|(r)$ is bounded as $r \rightarrow \infty$, then $f \in \mathbb{C}_p$. Indeed, this is an immediate consequence of the following useful result on entire functions [7]:

Lemma 2.2. *For any $f \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ there exists $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{C}_p$ and $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that f can be decomposed as*

$$\alpha_0 x^r \prod_{f(\alpha)=0} \left(1 - \frac{x}{\alpha}\right), \quad \alpha_0 \in \mathbb{C}_p, \quad r \in \mathbb{N}.$$

By means of this result we can prove the assertion of Remark 1.3:

Proof. Let a_s, b_t be the leading coefficients of A, B respectively and let $d(0, R)$ be a disk containing all zeros of A and B . It is well known, that when $|x| > R$, we have $|A(x)| = |a_s||x|^s, |B(x)| = |b_t||x|^t$. Consider now $\Gamma := \{x \mid r_1 < |x| < r_2\}$ with $r_2 > r_1 > R$ such that f, g have no zero inside Γ . Let k be the number of zeros of f and let l be the number of zeros of g in $d(0, r_1)$. So the number of zeros of f^2 (resp. g^2) is $2k$ (resp. $2l$). Due to Lemma 2.2, $|f(x)|$ is of the form $|\lambda x^k|$ inside Γ and $|g(x)|$ is of the form $|\mu x^l|$ inside Γ . Therefore $|A(x)f^2(x)|$ is of the form $|a_s \lambda x^{s+2k}|$, $|B(x)g^2(x)|$ is of the form $|b_t \mu x^{t+2l}|$. Since $Af^2 + Bg^2 = 1$, the two functions $|a_s \lambda| r^{s+2k}, |b_t \mu| r^{t+2l}$ must be equal in $]r_1, r_2[$. This contradicts that s, t have different parity. $\square$

The p -adic version of Liouville’s Theorem (and improvements of it, e.g. the p -adic Thue-Siegel-Roth Theorem, [9]) is well known:

Lemma 2.3. *For any $\alpha \in d(0, 1) \cap \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \mathbb{N}$ there exists a constant C such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\text{ord}_p(\alpha - n) \leq C + k \log_p(n),$$

where k is the degree of α over $\mathbb{Q}$.

We prepare Clark’s statement with the following elementary observation:

Proposition 2.4. *For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq N, \text{ord}_p(j) \leq s} \text{ord}_p(j) = \frac{1 - p^{-s}}{p - 1} - \frac{s}{p^{s+1}}.$$

Proof. For $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we introduce the sets $L_i^N := \{k \leq N : p^i \mid k, p^{i+1} \nmid k\}$. Then the power of this set is $|L_i^N| = \left\lfloor \frac{N}{p^i} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{N}{p^{i+1}} \right\rfloor$. For any pair $i \neq j$, L_i^N and L_j^N are disjoint, and $\bigcup_{i=0}^s L_i^N = \{j \mid j \leq N\}$. Also note that for $k \in L_i^N$, we have $\text{ord}_p(k) = i$. Therefore, due to $\sum_{j \leq N} \text{ord}_p(j) = \sum_{i=0}^s |L_i^N|(i)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq N} \text{ord}_p(j) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^s \left(\frac{N}{p^i} - \frac{N}{p^{i+1}} \right) (i) = \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^s \left(\frac{1}{p^i} - \frac{1}{p^{i+1}} \right) (i) = \frac{1 - p^{-s}}{p - 1} - \frac{s}{p^{s+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

The following Lemma is essentially due to D. N. Clark ([4]). However taking into account a comment by M. Setoyanagi ([11]) on Clark's conclusions we find it advisable to include an independent proof of this result. Compared with the original formulation in [4], also numbers not in $d(0, 1)$ are involved, and the notion 'non-Liouville number' is avoided.

Lemma 2.5. *If $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}_p$ is algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Z}_p$, then for sufficiently large m*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=m}^N \text{ord}_p(\alpha - i)}{N} = w(\alpha) \quad (2.2)$$

where $w(\alpha)$, the so-called 'weight' of α , is given by

$$w(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \frac{1 - p^{-[r(\alpha)]}}{p - 1} - \langle r(\alpha) \rangle p^{-[r(\alpha)] - 1} & : \alpha \in d(0, 1) \setminus \mathbb{Z}_p \\ \frac{1}{p - 1} & : \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p \\ \text{ord}_p(\alpha) & : \alpha \notin d(0, 1) \end{cases}$$

with $r(\alpha) := \sup_{i \geq 0} \text{ord}_p(\alpha - i)$.

Proof. We distinguish 4 cases:

Case 1: $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. With $m = \alpha + 1$ we have $\text{ord}_p(\prod_{j=m}^N (\alpha - j)) = \frac{N - m + 1 - \sigma(N - m + 1)}{p - 1}$. Since $\sigma(j) = O(\log(j))$ when $j \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=m}^N \text{ord}_p(\alpha - j) \rightarrow \frac{1}{p - 1},$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

Case 2: $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p \setminus \mathbb{N}$. We first establish lower bounds for the sum (2.2). For every natural number $\beta > N$ one has

$$\left| \frac{\beta(\beta - 1) \dots (\beta - N)}{(N + 1)!} \right|_p \leq 1.$$

Since $\mathbb{N}$ is dense in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ and due to the ultrametric rule "the strongest one wins", for any natural number N we can find some $\alpha_N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha_N > N$ and

$|\alpha_N - i|_p = |\alpha - i|_p$, for all $0 \leq i \leq N$. Therefore,

$$\left| \frac{\alpha(\alpha-1)\dots(\alpha-N)}{(N+1)!} \right|_p \leq 1$$

and due to formula (2.1) we infer

$$\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=m}^N \text{ord}_p(\alpha - j) \geq \frac{1}{p-1}.$$

Upper bounds for this sum can be achieved as follows. By induction it holds that

$$\frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{\alpha(\alpha-1)\dots(\alpha-n)} = \sum_{i+j=n} \frac{(-1)^{j+1}}{i!j!(\alpha-j)}. \quad (2.3)$$

Multiplying (2.3) by $n!$ and evaluating with respect to the norm $|\cdot|_p$ we conclude from $|\binom{n}{i}|_p = |\frac{n!}{i!(n-i)!}|_p \leq 1$ that

$$\left| \frac{n!}{(\alpha)_{n+1}} \right|_p \leq \max_{0 \leq j \leq n} \frac{1}{|\alpha - j|_p}. \quad (2.4)$$

Due to Lemma 2.3 there exists $C' \in \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for any natural number j , $|\alpha - j|_p \geq \frac{C'}{j^k}$ for $k = [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha) : \mathbb{Q}]$. After inserting this inequality into (2.4) we take the logarithm to the base p of the n -th root of (2.4). Monotonicity of the root yields and formula (2.1) yield

$$\frac{\text{ord}_p((\alpha)_{n+1})}{n} \leq \frac{1}{p-1} + \frac{k \log_p n - \sigma_p(n)}{n} - \frac{\log_p C'}{n} \quad (2.5)$$

and taking limits we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^N \text{ord}_p(\alpha - i)}{N} \leq \frac{1}{p-1}.$$

Case 3: $\alpha \in d(0,1) \setminus \mathbb{Z}_p$. This is the most tricky part. First, we observe that $r(\alpha) = \sup_{i \geq 0} \text{ord}_p(\alpha - i) = \max_{i' \in \mathbb{Z}_p} \text{ord}_p(\alpha - i')$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$, since $\mathbb{Z}_p$ is compactly contained in $\mathbb{C}_p$. Moreover, the maximum is taken on by a natural number, that is, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r(\alpha) = \text{ord}_p(\alpha - m)$. By setting $\beta := \frac{\alpha - m}{p^{[r(\alpha)]}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r(\beta) &= \sup_{j \geq 0} \text{ord}_p(\beta - j) = \sup_{j \geq 0} \text{ord}_p\left(\frac{\alpha - m}{p^{[r(\alpha)]}} - j\right) = \\ &= \sup_{j \geq 0} \text{ord}_p(\alpha - m - jp^{[r(\alpha)]}) - [r(\alpha)] = \\ &= \text{ord}_p(\alpha - m) - [r(\alpha)] = r(\alpha) - [r(\alpha)] = \langle r(\alpha) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For a fixed natural number $j > m$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord}_p(\alpha - j) &= \text{ord}_p\left(\beta + \frac{m-j}{p^{[r(\alpha)]}}\right) + [r(\alpha)] = [r(\alpha)] + \\ &+ \begin{cases} \langle r(\alpha) \rangle & , \quad \text{ord}_p\left(\frac{m-j}{p^{[r(\alpha)]}}\right) \geq \langle r(\alpha) \rangle \\ \text{ord}_p\left(\frac{m-j}{p^{[r(\alpha)]}}\right), & \text{ord}_p\left(\frac{m-j}{p^{[r(\alpha)]}}\right) < \langle r(\alpha) \rangle \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

The second case in the right hand side of the last formula follows from the ultrametric rule "the strongest one wins". Concerning the first one, we note that $r(\beta) = \text{ord}_p(\beta) = \langle r(\alpha) \rangle$, hence by the non-archimedean triangle's inequality, $\text{ord}_p(\beta + \frac{m-j}{p^{[r(\alpha)]}}) \geq \langle r(\alpha) \rangle$. The reversed inequality holds due to the maximality of $r(\beta)$. Rewriting the latter formula we receive

$$\text{ord}_p(\alpha - j) = \begin{cases} r(\alpha), & \text{ord}_p(j - m) \geq [r(\alpha)] + 1 \\ \text{ord}_p(j - m), & \text{ord}_p(j - m) \leq [r(\alpha)] \end{cases}.$$

It remains to verify (2.2). Since $r(\alpha - m) = r(\alpha)$ we may assume without loss of generality $m = 0$. With this choice we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^N \text{ord}_p(\alpha - j) &= r(\alpha) |\{j \leq N \mid \text{ord}_p(j) \geq [r(\alpha)] + 1\}| \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N, \text{ord}_p(j) \leq [r(\alpha)]} \text{ord}_p(j) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\{j \leq N \mid \text{ord}_p(j) \geq [r(\alpha)] + 1\}| = |\{j \leq N \mid p^{[r(\alpha)]+1} \mid j\}| = \left\lfloor \frac{N}{p^{[r(\alpha)]+1}} \right\rfloor$. Furthermore, due to Lemma 2.4,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq N, \text{ord}_p(j) \leq [r(\alpha)]} \text{ord}_p(j) \rightarrow \frac{1 - p^{-[r(\alpha)]}}{p - 1} - \frac{[r(\alpha)]}{p^{[r(\alpha)]+1}}$$

when $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \leq N} \text{ord}_p(\alpha - j) = \frac{1 - p^{-r[\alpha]}}{p - 1} - \langle r(\alpha) \rangle p^{-[r(\alpha)]-1},$$

which finishes the proof in Case 3.

Case 4: $\alpha \notin d(0, 1)$. This is the trivial case, since due to the ultrametric rule "the strongest one wins" and $\text{ord}_p(i) \geq 0$ for all $i \geq 0$, one has $\text{ord}_p(\alpha - i) = \text{ord}_p(\alpha)$ for all $i \geq 0$. $\square$

The following remark is due:

Remark 2.6. *The proof of "Case 3" seems to be more transparent than the one given in ([4]). Also, in "Case 2" no geometric argument using 'Newton Polygons' is involved, as has been in ([4]). Instead, we decompose the left side term of (2.3) into partial fractions.*

An immediate consequence of Lemma 2.5 is the following

Corollary 2.7. *For any $P \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x] \setminus \{0\}$ there exists an integer $m \geq 0$ such that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=m}^N \text{ord}_p(P(i)) < \infty.$$

Proof. Decompose P into a product of linear terms $x - \alpha_j$, where $\alpha_j \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ ($j = 1, \dots, \deg P$) times a constant. Due to the additivity of the valuation we may apply Lemma 2.5 to each of the factors. $\square$

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

Lemma 3.1. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ and $AB \in \mathbb{C}_p[x] \setminus \{0\}$ such that (1.1) holds. Then f and g satisfy the system of differential equations*

$$A'f + 2Af' = hg, \quad B'g + 2Bg' = -hf \quad (3.1)$$

for a certain polynomial h over $\mathbb{C}_p$ with $\deg h \leq \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1$. Furthermore, if $\deg A > -\infty$ (that is $A \neq 0$) we have for some $\gamma > 0$, $\|A'f + 2Af'\|(r) \leq \gamma r^{\deg A - 1} \|f\|(r)$ when r sufficiently large.

Proof. Differentiating the identity $Af^2 + Bg^2 = 1$ yields $f(A'f + 2Af') = -g(B'g + 2Bg')$. Since f and g have no common zeros, there exists $h \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ due to Lemma 2.2 such that $A'f + 2Af' = hg$, $B'g + 2Bg' = -hf$. Moreover, due to the identity $Af^2 + Bg^2 = 1$ we have for r sufficiently large, $\|Af^2\|(r) = \|Bg^2\|(r)$, i.e. $\frac{\|g\|(r)}{\|f\|(r)} = \gamma r^{\frac{\deg A - \deg B}{2}}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. Thus

$$\|h\|(r) = \frac{\|(Bg^2)'\|(r)}{\|g\|(r)\|f\|(r)} \leq \gamma r^{\frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1}$$

so we see that h is a polynomial of degree $\leq \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1$. $\square$

Example 3.2. The equation $f^2 + g^2 = 1$ has no non-constant entire solutions: For, if there exists f, g s.t. $f^2 + g^2 = (f + ig)(f - ig) = 1$, where $i = \sqrt{-1}$, then, by taking norms on both sides yields $\|f + ig\|(r)\|f - ig\|(r) = 1$. Now, if $f + ig \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p) \setminus \mathbb{C}_p$, then for $r \rightarrow \infty$ we have $\|f + ig\|(r) \rightarrow \infty$ which implies $\|f - ig\|(r) \rightarrow 0$, and therefore $f = ig$ which yields the contradiction $f^2 + g^2 = 0$.

Example 3.3. For $a \in \mathbb{C}_p$, the equation $f^2 + (x - a)g^2 = 1$ has no entire solutions but $f = \pm 1, g = 0$: Assume $g \neq 0$. Due to Lemma 3.1, the mentioned polynomial h is identically zero, therefore $f' = 0$, but $(x - a)g^2$ cannot be a constant.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ satisfy $A'f + 2Af' = hg, B'g + 2Bg' = -hf$ for $A, B, h \in \mathbb{C}_p[x], h \neq 0$, then f satisfies a linear differential equation of second order:*

$$(4ABh)f'' + (6A'Bh + 2AB'h - 4ABh')f' + (A'B'h + 2A''Bh - 2BA'h' + h^3)f = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.1, (3.1) holds for f and g which implies $g = \frac{1}{h}(A'f + 2Af')$. Differentiation yields $g' = \frac{-h'}{h^2}(A'f + 2Af') + \frac{1}{h}(A''f + 3A'f' + 2Af'')$. Inserting g, g' into (3.1) yields (3.2). $\square$

Definition 3.5. Consider a differential equation of the following form:

$$Q^{(2)}(x)y'' + Q^{(1)}(x)y' + Q^{(0)}(x)y = 0, \quad Q^{(i)} \in \mathbb{C}_p[x] \quad (i = 0, 1, 2) \quad (E)$$

with $Q^{(2)}$ not identically zero. We define the characteristic number of (E) as $N(E) = \max_{i=0,1,2} \deg Q^{(i)} - i$, and the characteristic polynomial of (E) as

$$P_E(\xi) := \sum_{\deg Q^{(j)} - j = N(E)} q_{\deg Q^{(j)}}^{(j)}(\xi)$$

where $q_{\deg Q^{(j)}}^{(j)}$ ($j = 0, 1, 2$) are the leading coefficients of the polynomials $Q^{(j)}$ ($j = 0, 1, 2$).

The following remark highlights the meaning of Definition 3.5:

Remark 3.6. Assume that $f(x) = \sum_{i \geq 0} c_i x^i \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p) \setminus \mathbb{C}_p[x]$ solves (E). Then there exists a corresponding recurrence relation for the coefficients of f :

$$P_t(n)c_{n+t} + \dots + P_1(n)c_{n+1} + P_E(n)c_n = 0 \quad (3.3)$$

with certain polynomials $P_s \in \mathbb{C}_p[x]$, where $1 \leq s \leq t$, $P_t \neq 0$ and where P_E is the characteristic polynomial of (E).

Notation 3.7. We write the polynomials A, B and h (due to Lemma 3.1) in the following way:

$$A(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\eta} a_i x^i, \quad B(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\chi} b_j x^j, \quad h(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} h_k x^k, \quad a_{\eta}, b_{\chi} \neq 0,$$

i.e., A, B are polynomials of degree η resp. χ . Note that h might be identically zero.

We now determine the characteristic polynomial of equation (3.2):

Lemma 3.8. *Let $A, B \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$, $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$ such that (1.1) holds. Suppose the polynomial h of Lemma (3.1) is not identically zero¹ and that $g(0) \neq 0$, $f^{(i)}(0) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ for $0 \leq i \leq \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1$, and $g^{(i)}(0) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ for $0 \leq i < \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1$. Then the characteristic polynomial P_E of the corresponding differential equation (3.2) is an element of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$.*

Proof. We make use of the notation introduced in Definition 3.5 for the polynomial coefficients of (3.2): $Q^{(2)} = 4ABh$, $Q^{(1)} = 6A'Bh + 2AB'h - 4ABh'$, $Q^{(0)} = A'B'h + 2A''Bh - 2BA'h' + h^3$. Recall that $a_{\eta}, b_{\chi}, h_{\mu}$ denote the coefficients of the leading powers of the resp. polynomials. Note that

$$N(E) := \max_{i=0,1,2} \deg Q(i) - i = \eta + \chi + \mu - 2$$

since $\deg Q^{(1)} \leq \eta + \chi + \mu - 1$ and $\deg Q^{(0)} \leq \eta + \chi + \mu - 2$. First, let us calculate the coefficients q_j of the term $x^{N(E)+j}$ in $Q^{(j)}$ ($j = 0, 1, 2$) depending on the degree of h ($q_j = 0$ might vanish for $j = 1$ or $j = 0$!)

- (1) $\mu = \deg h = \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1 = \frac{\eta + \chi}{2} - 1$: Then $q_2 = 4a_{\eta}b_{\chi}h_{\mu}$, $q_1 = a_{\eta}b_{\chi}h_{\mu}(6\eta + 2\chi - 4\mu)$ and finally $q_0 = a_{\eta}b_{\chi}h_{\mu}(\eta\chi + 2\eta(\eta - 1) - 2\eta\mu + \frac{h_{\mu}^2}{a_{\eta}b_{\chi}})$.
- (2) $\mu = \deg h < \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1 = \frac{\eta + \chi}{2} - 1$: Then, due to the calculations in the case above $q_2 = 4a_{\eta}b_{\chi}h_{\mu}$, $q_1 = a_{\eta}b_{\chi}h_{\mu}(6\eta + 2\chi - 4\mu)$ and $q_0 = a_{\eta}b_{\chi}h_{\mu}(\eta\chi + 2\eta(\eta - 1) - 2\eta\mu)$.

We derive the characteristic polynomial $P_E(\xi)$:

- (1) $\mu = \deg h = \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1 = \frac{\eta + \chi}{2} - 1$: $P_E(\xi) = a_{\eta}b_{\chi}h_{\mu}[4\xi(\xi - 1) + 4(\eta + 1)\xi + (\eta^2 + \frac{h_{\mu}^2}{a_{\eta}b_{\chi}})]$.
- (2) $\mu = \deg h < \frac{\deg A + \deg B}{2} - 1 = \frac{\eta + \chi}{2} - 1$: $P_E(\xi) = a_{\eta}b_{\chi}h_{\mu}[4\xi(\xi - 1) + (6\eta + 2\chi - 4\mu)\xi + (\eta\chi + 2\eta(\eta - 1) - 2\eta\mu)]$.

Due to our assumptions it suffices to show that the leading coefficient h_{μ} of h is algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}$. Indeed by differentiating $h = \frac{A'f + 2Af'}{g}$ μ -times and using Lemma 3.1 we infer

$$\mu!h_{\mu} = (h(x))^{(\mu)} = \left(\frac{(A(x)f^2(x))'}{fg} \right)^{(\mu)}.$$

¹this in particular implies $\deg A + \deg B \geq 2$

The right hand side involves derivatives up to order $\mu + 1$ of f and of up to order μ of g . Due to our assumptions the coefficients of f, g up to order $\mu + 1$ resp. μ are algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}$, and since the coefficients of A, B have the same property, we are done. $\square$

We shall also employ the 'entire version' of [2, Proposition]):

Lemma 3.9. *Consider the linear differential equation*

$$C(x)y'(x) + D(x)y(x) = 0, \quad C(x), D(x) \in K[x]$$

with C not identically zero. Let $y(x) \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p)$. Then $y(x) \in \mathbb{C}_p[x]$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 Let $f, g \in \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{C}_p) \setminus \mathbb{C}_p[x]$ such that (1.1) holds. By Lemma 3.1, f, g satisfy equation (3.1) with a certain polynomial $h \in \mathbb{C}_p[x]$. We have the two cases:

Case 1: h identically zero: Due to Lemma 3.9, the solutions of system (3.1) are in $\mathbb{C}_p[x]$, which is impossible.

Case 2: h not identically zero: Due to Lemma 3.4, f satisfies a linear differential equation of the form (3.2). Moreover, due to Lemma 3.8, the characteristic polynomial P_E of (3.2) lies in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$. Following the notation of Remark 3.6 we consider a recurrence relation for the coefficients c_n of $f(x) = \sum_{n \geq 0} c_n x^n$, n sufficiently large

$$P_t(n)c_{n+t} + \dots + P_1(n)c_{n+1} + P_E(n)c_n = 0, \quad t > 0 \quad (3.4)$$

We consider the non-trivial case, where P_t is not identically zero. Clearly P_E is not identically zero, because h is not. Since we can multiply equation (3.4) with an appropriate constant γ , we may assume without loss of generality that $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, t\} \forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \text{ord}_p(P_i(n)) \geq 0$ where we have set $P_0 := \gamma P_E$. We have $P_E \in \gamma \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[x]$ due to Lemma 3.8. Moreover, by induction it follows for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist certain polynomials $P_{i,k}, i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ with $\text{ord}_p(P_{i,k}(n)) \geq 0 \forall n \geq 1$ such that the following recurrence relation is satisfied for any n :

$$P_{t,k}(n)c_{n+t+k} + \dots + P_{1,k}(n)c_{n+k+1} + P_0(n)P_0(n+1) \dots P_0(n+k)c_n = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

Evaluation with respect to ord_p yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ord}_p(P_0(n)P_0(n+1) \dots P_0(n+k)) + \text{ord}_p(c_n) &\geq \\ &\geq \min\{\text{ord}_p(c_{n+t+k}), \dots, \text{ord}_p(c_{n+k+1})\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Moreover, due to Corollary 2.7, $\exists L \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{ord}_p(P_0(n)P_0(n+1) \dots P_0(n+k))}{n+k} = L$. Consider now the growth of c_n , the coefficients of f : the transcendence of f implies that $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ord}_p(c_n) - \lambda n = \infty$. In other words, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any real constant $c(\lambda)$ we have $\text{ord}_p(c_n) \geq c(\lambda) + \lambda n$ for sufficiently large n . We may choose $\lambda > L$ and some $c(\lambda)$. Applying this to (3.6) divided by $n+k$ yields for sufficiently large n :

$$\frac{\text{ord}_p(P_0(n)P_0(n+1) \dots P_0(n+k))}{n+k} + \frac{\text{ord}_p(c_n)}{n+k} \geq \frac{c(\lambda) + \lambda(n+k+1)}{n+k}. \quad (3.7)$$

Taking the limites on both sides ($k \rightarrow \infty$) we derive the contradiction $L \geq \lambda$.

Acknowledgement: For reading this manuscript carefully I am indebted to Professor Alain Escassut (Clermont-Ferrand, France). Special thanks to the referee for suggesting a number of simplifications which lead to the final form of this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. BOUTABAA, *On some p -adic functional equations*, in p -adic functional analysis (Nijmegen, 1996), vol. 192 of Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., Dekker, New York, 1997, pp. 49–59.
- [2] A. BOUTABAA, *A note on p -adic linear differential equations*, J. Number Theory, 87 (2001), pp. 301–305.
- [3] A. BOUTABAA AND A. ESCASSUT, *An improvement of the p -adic Nevanlinna theory and application to meromorphic functions*, in p -adic functional analysis (Poznań, 1998), vol. 207 of Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., Dekker, New York, 1999, pp. 29–38.
- [4] D. N. CLARK, *A note on the p -adic convergence of solutions of linear differential equations*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 17 (1966), pp. 262–269.
- [5] A. ESCASSUT, *Analytic elements in p -adic analysis*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1995.
- [6] F. GROSS, *On the equation $f^n + g^n = 1$* , Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 72 (1966), pp. 86–88.
- [7] P.-C. HU AND C.-C. YANG, *Meromorphic functions over non-Archimedean fields*, vol. 522 of Mathematics and its Applications, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000.
- [8] I. LAINE, *Nevanlinna theory and complex differential equations*, vol. 15 of de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1993.
- [9] D. RIDOUT, *The p -adic generalization of the Thue-Siegel-Roth theorem*, Mathematika, 5 (1958), pp. 40–48.
- [10] A. M. ROBERT, *A course in p -adic analysis*, vol. 198 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [11] M. SETOYANAGI, *Note on Clark's theorem for p -adic convergence*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 125 (1997), pp. 717–721.
- [12] N. TODA, *On the functional equation $\sum_{i=0}^p a_i f_i^{n_i} = 1$* , Tôhoku Math. J. (2), 23 (1971), pp. 289–299.
- [13] C.-C. YANG, *A generalization of a theorem of P. Montel on entire functions*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 26 (1970), pp. 332–334.

VIENNA INSTITUTE OF FINANCE, UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA AND VIENNA UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, HEILIGENSTÄDTERSTRASSE 46-48, 1190 VIENNA, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: eberhard.mayerhofer@vif.ac.at